

Serial No. 10/606,864

Attorney Docket No. 26B-018

REMARKS

Claims 2-11, 13 and 14 are pending. Claims 1 and 12 have been canceled. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2-11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Randall *et al.* in view of the Japanese publication of Hino *et al.* The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite an annealed molded article. Further, claim 13 has been amended to change "comprising" to "consisting of" at the end of the preamble. Neither Randall *et al.* nor Hino *et al.* discloses or suggests annealing a molded article that consists of the recited components. Therefore, a combination of these references fails to render the claimed molded article obvious, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

The patent to Hino *et al.* discloses a composition containing starch as the main ingredient. Poly(lactic acid), poly(butylene succinate) and acrylic modified fluorinated resin are blended with the starch. Thus, a combination of Hino *et al.* and Randall *et al.* would contain starch and thus would fail to satisfy the terms of claim 13. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 recites that the molded article is annealed. By annealing the molded article, the heat resistance of the molded article is improved. Blending of PTFE without annealing does not improve heat resistance (Compare B-1 with B-4). Annealing of the PTFE-blended composition markedly improves heat resistance compared with simple annealing. (Compare A-3 with A-12.)

Serial No. 10/606,864

Attorney Docket No. 26B-018


In response to the annealing limitation in claim 13, the office action relies on a teaching in Randall *et al.* that components are mixed at elevated temperatures. This is not the same as annealing a molded product. Annealing a molded product involves heating the molded product, not a mixture that exists before molding has occurred. Therefore, the combination of Randall *et al.* and Hino *et al.* fails to meet the claim terms, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested because the amendment is considered to place the application in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,


James E. Barlow
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400